

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT SEATTLE

7 NOEL WOODARD,
8
9 Plaintiff,

Cause No. C23-0033RSL

10 v.
11 BOEING EMPLOYEES CREDIT UNION., *et
al.*,

ORDER

12 Defendants.

13
14 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's *ex parte* "Motion for Admission *Pro
Hac Vice* and for Limited Exemption from Local Counsel Rule." Dkt. # 11. Pursuant to Local
15 Civil Rule 83.1(d)(1), an attorney who neither resides nor maintains an office for the practice of
16 law in this district may, upon application and a showing of a particular need, appear and
17 participate in the case *pro hac vice*. The client must, however, also be represented by local
18 counsel who has a physical office within the boundaries of the district and is admitted to practice
19 before this Court. Local counsel has discrete and specific duties, all of which require familiarity
20 with the local rules and the judges of this district. LCR 83.1(d)(2).

21 Plaintiff argues that counsel who does not satisfy the physical office requirement should
22 be permitted to act as local counsel because the case was removed from state court, where
23 attorney Mark J. Hilliard of Walnut Creek, California, had already been retained to act as local
24

1 counsel for Scott E. Cole and Cody A. Bolce of Oakland, California. The fact that plaintiff did
2 not choose to litigate in this venue places her on the same footing as virtually every defendant: it
3 is not a justification for ignoring the physical office requirement. This district is committed to
4 maintaining a high degree of professionalism and civility among the lawyers practicing here and
5 requires local counsel to remind *pro hac vice* counsel of their obligations, to review and sign all
6 filings, to ensure that all filings comply with the local rules of this Court, and to be available and
7 prepared to handle hearings and conferences if out-of-district counsel are unable to be present on
8 the date scheduled by the Court. LCR 83.1(d)(2). Counsel who do not regularly practice in the
9 Western District of Washington and do not maintain an office here may not fully comprehend
10 the magnitude of their responsibilities and may not be well-placed to serve the functions
11 assigned to local counsel.

12 Plaintiff also suggests that she will be prejudiced if her chosen attorneys are not permitted
13 to represent her in this case. This argument would effectively abrogate the local rule if adopted.
14 The Court declines to do so. Mr. Cole and Mr. Bolce simply need to associate themselves with
15 counsel who meets the requirements of LCR 83.1 to be permitted to appear in this case. They
16 offer no justification (such as Mr. Hilliard's long-standing relationship with the client and the
17 matters to be litigated or the unavailability of qualified, unconflicted practitioners in this district)
18 for a waiver of those requirements.

19 //
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

For all of the foregoing reasons, the motion to waive the physical office requirement (Dkt. # 11) is DENIED.

Dated this 30th day of January, 2023.

Robert S. Lasnik
Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge